

88 01674

Bay Area Economics. INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY
Initial findings of the tenants survey,
Oct. 12, 1988.

MAR 8 1990

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAR 8 1990

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Bay

Area

Economics

2560 Ninth Street
Suite 213B
Berkeley, CA 94710
415 549-7310

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY
OCT 18 1988
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MEMORANDUM

October 12, 1988

TO: Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board Commissioners

FROM: Bay Area Economics

SUBJ: Initial Findings of the Tenants Survey

INTRODUCTION

Last May the Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board retained Bay Area Economics to complete a two-phased study with several major components. One component of this study was to first define, and then document the extent of the historically low rent issue in Berkeley. These definitions were presented to the Rent Board Commissioners in July and the work on defining the extent of the problem, including completion of five in-depth case studies of properties with historically low rents, is almost complete. The results of this research will be presented to the Board at a later date. The purpose of this memo is to outline some of the results of the second component of the overall work program: the tenants survey. This survey was designed to provide the Rent Stabilization Board with statistically reliable information about the type, quality and condition of the units covered by rent control, as well as to provide a demographic profile of the tenants living in these units. The survey provides some basis of comparison with both the 1980 Census data and earlier surveys. But more importantly, it will provide a statistically reliable base line against which the results of future surveys can be compared to form an ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of rent control in Berkeley.

The survey was conducted by mailing a questionnaire to 2,000 households randomly selected from the approximately 20,000 units in the City's Rent Certification Data Base. This data base represents only those units that are covered by the Rent Stabilization and Eviction For Good Cause ordinance and have been legally registered. There are numerous additional rental units in Berkeley that were not included in the sample because they are exempt from rent control. These units include Section 8 housing, other publicly assisted housing, student cooperatives, duplexes where one unit is owner occupied, units that should be but are not registered with the Rent Board, and units constructed since 1980.

Each respondent completing a questionnaire was asked to provide information about the type of unit rented by his or her household, the quality of this unit, the rent being paid, the basic demographic characteristics of the household, and the nature of the household's relationship with the landlord/property manager. Each household in the sample received an initial copy of the

questionnaire accompanied by an explanatory cover letter and a stamped return envelope. One week after the initial questionnaire had been sent, all households in the sample received a postcard reminding them to complete and return the survey. Three weeks later a second copy of the questionnaire along with another explanatory cover letter and stamped envelope were sent to all households that had not responded by a certain date.

The sampling frame for the survey was developed based on the same five Submarket Areas defined as part of the historically low rent study being conducted at the same time, as shown in Figure 1. (For a detailed discussion of how these submarket areas were defined, see BAE's memo to the Rent Stabilization Board Commissioners of July 18, 1988.) The intent was to sample a large enough number of households in each Submarket Area to ensure a response in each area that would give statistically reliable results. Therefore, the total sample contained an equal number of households from each of the five Submarket Areas. All results of the survey are shown by Submarket Area as well as by Citywide totals. The Citywide totals were derived by weighting the Submarket Area responses by the total number of certified rental units in each area. The overall response rate for the survey is shown in Table 1. There were a total of 826 useable responses with over 1,000 total responses, including surveys returned because the unit was vacant or the address was incorrect, the units was owner occupied, etc. This response rate was more than adequate for developing statistically reliable conclusions about the characteristics of tenants in rent controlled units. The responses were also checked against other data, including the 1980 census to make sure that there was no evidence of major bias in the results.

The results presented below include the responses to only a few of the most basic questions on the questionnaire. The full results of the survey will be presented to the Rent Stabilization Board in a final report that will be available in late October or early November. However, the tables included here begin to answer some of the most basic questions about what type of units are actually affected by rent control: the perceived quality of these units; the gross rent people are paying; the length of time people have lived in their units, their previous place of residence, and the way in which they found their unit; the demographic characteristics of tenants; the amount of rent people households are paying as a percent of their gross income; and, the general impressions tenants have regarding the overall effectiveness of the Rent Stabilization and Eviction For Good Cause ordinance in meeting its specified goals.

SURVEY RESULTS

The Rent Controlled Housing Stock. Tables 2-4 show the general characteristics of the rent controlled housing stock in terms of the type of building these units are in, the size of the building, and the type of unit as defined by the number of bedrooms. The data represent only units covered by rent control and does not pertain to all rental units in the City. As shown in Table 2, almost 90 percent of the rent controlled units surveyed are apartments and 8 percent are houses. Submarket Area 3, which is the area immediately adjacent to the U.C. campus, has the highest percentage of

apartments, while Submarket Areas 4 and 1 have highest percentage of rental houses. This result is generally consistent with the overall development pattern throughout the City.

Most units responding were in medium or small buildings with about 90 percent located in buildings with 25 or fewer units as shown in Table 3. This finding is consistent with the previous table because it shows that the larger buildings, representing greater development intensity, are concentrated in Submarket Area 3. About 60 percent of the apartments in Submarket Area 3 are in buildings with ten or more units as compared to Submarket Areas 4 where over 90 percent of the units are in buildings with ten units or less and Submarket Area 5 where over 80 percent of the units are in buildings with ten units or less.

Small ^{units} ~~apartments~~ dominate the rent controlled stock with only 6 percent of the apartments having three or more bedrooms. Table 4 shows that Submarket Areas 3 and 5 have a higher percentage of studio and one bedroom units compared to the other areas. Submarket Areas 1, 2 and 4 have a higher percentage of units with two or more bedrooms relative to the other areas. Again, this finding is consistent with what was shown on previous tables indicating that these three areas have a high proportion of houses which can generally be expected to have more bedrooms than apartments.

Building And Unit Condition. The next series of tables (Tables 5-7) shows how respondents perceived the overall condition of their units. These tables give an overall indication of the livability of rent controlled units, as well as suggesting the general direction of change in building. As Table 5 shows, over 40 percent of the total respondents considered their building conditions to be either excellent or good. Respondents in Submarket Area 1 were more positive about their buildings, with about 60 percent of the respondents saying their buildings were in excellent or good condition. Submarket Areas 4 and 5 had the highest proportion of problems with about 20 percent of the respondents in each area saying their buildings were in poor condition.

It is interesting to note that although only about 16 percent of the respondents citywide considered their building condition to be poor, almost one-quarter of the respondents felt that the condition of their building had gotten worse since they moved in, as shown on Table 6. Responses from Submarket Areas 4 and 5 the greatest number of buildings with deterioration in condition. Even though this relatively high proportion of respondents thought building condition had gotten worse, a relatively high proportion of respondents also felt that their building condition had improved. About 17 percent of the total sample said that conditions in their building had improved since they moved in, with the greatest improvement in Submarket Area 2 where almost 25 percent of the respondents said their building condition was better now it was then when they moved in.

Table 7 shows that people were generally more positive about the condition of their own unit than they were about the condition of their buildings overall. However, respondents in Submarket Area 4 had a much higher percentage of units rated as in fair or poor condition than did respondents in any of the other Submarket Areas.

Gross Rents. Table 8 shows the distribution of gross rents for all respondents and by Submarket Area. Gross rent is the amount each household pays each month for rent, utilities and other charges associated with their unit including rental fees for furniture or parking. Gross, rather than contract, rent is shown here because ^{gross} ~~contract~~ rent is a more realistic measure of actual housing costs. Overall, the mean gross rent for all respondents was \$436, with about 50 percent of the households in the sample paying less than \$400 per month.

The responses to the survey question regarding rents are consistent with the expectation that rents would be higher in "North" Berkeley than they would be in the south and west Submarket Areas. It is also interesting to notice the extent of the rent differential among the Submarket areas. Over 40 percent of the units in Submarket Area 4 rent for less than \$300 per month and just over one-third of the units in Submarket Area 5 are also below this level. In contrast, over one-half of the units in Submarket Areas 1 and 3 rent for more than \$400 per month. Some of this rent differential can be explained by the desirability of one location versus another; it can also be attributed to differences in unit size. In Submarket Area 1 about 20 percent of the units had rents of \$600 or more. This area also had a larger proportion of houses and apartments with 4 or more bedrooms than any other Submarket area. Yet Submarket Area 3, which has the highest concentration of studio and one-bedroom apartments also has the highest proportion of rents over \$400. This can best be explained by historically high demand for units which are close to the U.C. campus.

Length of Tenure and Mobility. The length of tenure is an important indicator of the responsiveness of a housing market to peoples' need for mobility. Table 9 shows that almost one-third of the respondents moved into their current unit within the last fifteen months. Submarket Area 3 had the highest proportion of tenants who had lived in their current unit for eighteen months or less which is consistent with the large, and very mobile, student population living in this area. In contrast, Submarket Area 4 had the highest proportion of residents who had lived in their units for twenty years or more. It is worth noting that this Submarket Area also had the highest concentration of low rents, indicating that at least in this area, long term residents may be benefitting from rent control.

As Table 10 shows, the mobility of tenants in Berkeley is probably affected by who knows whom. Almost two-thirds of all respondents indicated that they found their current unit through some informal network including knowing a former tenant, the landlord, or by word of mouth. The results also indicate that access to the University housing office does not necessarily help people find rental units.

The results of these two tables indicate that there are relatively good mobility opportunities for tenants who are already living in Berkeley or have good connections to others living in the City. This finding seems even stronger in light of the responses shown in Table 11 indicating that almost two-thirds of the respondents moved into their current unit from another place either in Berkeley or another East Bay Community.

Demographic Characteristics. Table 12 shows the distribution of household types by Submarket Area. Over one-half of the respondents city-wide lived by themselves and fewer than 15 percent were households with children (including single parent households). The large number of households made up of unrelated adults other than couples, particularly in Submarket Area 3, shows that many of the City's renter households are probably occupied by groups of young people, many of whom are likely to be students. It is also interesting to note that almost 21 percent of the respondents in Submarket Area 4 were households of single mothers living with their children.

Household incomes of respondents also reflected expected patterns, as shown in Table 13. Almost one-half of the respondents in Submarket Area 1 had household incomes of \$25,000 or more while in Submarket Area 4 almost 60 percent of the respondents had household incomes of less than \$15,000. Submarket Area 3 also showed a relatively high concentration of households earning less than \$15,000; however, many of these low incomes can probably be attributed to the fact that many people who live in this area are students.

Table 14 shows the ethnic background of the respondents. As expected, there was a much higher concentration of whites in Submarket Areas 1 and 3. Submarket Areas 4 and 5 had the highest percentage of blacks while Submarket Area 3 had the highest proportion of Asians. Hispanics appeared to be more heavily concentrated in Submarket Areas 1, 2, and 3.

The results shown on Table 14 are of considerable interest since there has been ongoing concern in Berkeley about the loss of black population. The City's Housing Element, adopted in 1985, cited loss of black population as key evidence that Berkeley was having trouble providing "decent and affordable housing" for its residents. This conclusion was based on the fact that the City had lost 24 percent of its total black population and about 18 percent of black renters between 1970 and 1980. In 1980, black households represented 18 percent of total renter households. The question is, has this decline in black population continued through the 1980's? Although these survey results only show blacks as comprising about 11 percent the total sample, this sample represents only households living in rent controlled units. As was discussed in the introduction to this memo, rent controlled units do not include all rental units in Berkeley. A major component of the rental stock not covered by rent control is Section 8 units. When the number of black households living in Section 8 units is added to the number of black households living in rent controlled units, blacks account for over 16 percent of the total. While there are still a number of households unaccounted for, this finding indicates that blacks have retained most of their proportional share of renter population since 1980.

Rent Burden. A key measure of the long term success of rent control is whether or not people are paying an appropriate share of their total income for rent. This proportion, known as rent burden, should, according to HUD standards, be about 30 percent. In other words, an acceptable rent burden is when gross rent accounts for no more than 30 percent of any given household's total

gross income. Table 15 shows the distribution of rent burdens by Submarket Area as well as for the total sample. Citywide just under two-thirds of the respondents paid 30 percent or less of their income for rent. Respondents in Submarket Area 1 had the lowest rent burden, which is consistent with the finding in Table 13 showing that this area also had the highest mean income. Otherwise, there is not much difference among the other four Submarket Areas in terms of the proportion of respondents who were paying less than or equal to 30 percent of their income for rent.

Table 16 shows the distribution of rent burden by income level for the entire sample. Respondents whose household earned less than \$10,000 per year in 1987 accounted for about 19 percent of the total sample. Of this 19 percent, only about 10 percent paid 30 percent or less of their income for rent. Almost 30 percent of the total sample was households earning between \$10,000 and \$19,999 in 1987. About one-half of these people paid 30 percent or less of their income for rent. Another one-quarter of the sample earned between \$20,000 and \$29,999 in 1987 and in this group over 90 percent paid 30 percent or less of their income for rent. For households with incomes of \$30,000 and above, households paying more than 30 percent declines to an insignificant number.

Perceptions of Rent Control. Tables 17-19 show the respondents' perceptions about the effectiveness of the Rent Stabilization and Eviction For Good Cause ordinance. As Table 17 shows, most respondents thought that the ordinance had been very successful or somewhat successful in preventing unfair rent increases. When asked about prevention of unfair evictions, about 68 percent said the ordinance had been very or somewhat successful. However, almost 30 percent of the respondents had no opinion on this issue. Table 18 shows that the respondents thought the ordinance had been slightly less successful at maintaining affordable housing for special groups. Only about 63 percent of the respondents thought the ordinance had been very or somewhat successful while, over 26 percent thought it had been not very or completely unsuccessful.

FIGURE 1: SUBMARKET AREA MAP

Berkeley Historically Low Rent Study

Source: Bay Area Economics



Table 1: Survey Response Rate by Submarket Area

Type of Response	Submarket Area					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Tenant Responses	184	165	189	138	150	826
Owner Occupied	17	18	5	16	8	64
Manager Occupied	5	4	1	2	3	15
Vacant	9	9	5	23	10	56
Not Deliverable	5	9	11	5	5	35
Other	0	2	5	3	4	29
No Response	180	193	184	213	220	975
Total	400	400	400	400	400	2,000

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 2: Distribution of Units within Submarket Areas by Unit Type

Type of Unit	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
House	15.2%	12.2%	4.8%	20.4%	6.7%	8.3%
Apartment/flat	78.8%	86.6%	93.6%	75.2%	90.6%	89.5%
Room-Hotels & Boarders	0.5%	0.0%	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%	1.0%
Other	5.4%	1.2%	0.0%	3.6%	2.0%	1.3%
% Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 3: Distribution of Units within Submarket Areas by Building Size

Number of units in building	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	18.4%	15.9%	7.4%	24.4%	10.1%	11.3%
2	12.1%	17.2%	5.1%	16.3%	15.8%	10.5%
3 to 4	19.5%	19.2%	8.6%	35.8%	34.5%	17.4%
5 to 9	21.3%	21.9%	18.9%	14.6%	23.7%	20.3%
10 to 24	23.0%	19.9%	42.9%	8.9%	13.7%	29.9%
25 to 49	5.7%	6.0%	12.0%	0.0%	2.2%	8.0%
50 and up	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
% Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 4: Distribution of Units within Submarket Areas by Number of Bedrooms

Number of bedrooms	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Studio	13.1%	13.0%	22.2%	10.1%	12.8%	17.3%
1	37.2%	38.9%	42.2%	40.6%	46.6%	41.8%
2	38.3%	43.2%	29.7%	40.6%	37.2%	34.9%
3	8.7%	4.3%	3.8%	8.0%	2.7%	4.4%
4	2.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
5 or more	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%
% Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

**Table 5: Distribution within Submarket Areas
of Responses Regarding Building Condition**

Building Condition	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Excellent	12.8%	9.8%	8.5%	8.7%	4.0%	8.4%
Good	47.2%	37.4%	33.5%	30.4%	34.2%	35.6%
Fair	32.2%	41.1%	41.0%	39.9%	42.3%	40.3%
Poor	7.8%	11.7%	17.0%	21.0%	19.5%	15.7%
% Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

**Table 6: Distribution within Submarket Area of Responses
Regarding Changes in Building Conditions**

Building Condition	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Better	17.7%	24.2%	13.4%	21.7%	18.8%	17.2%
Same	60.8%	56.5%	62.6%	50.7%	54.9%	59.3%
Worse	21.5%	19.3%	24.1%	27.5%	26.4%	23.4%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Note: Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 7: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Responses Regarding Unit Condition

Unit Condition	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Excellent	13.9%	11.0%	11.8%	7.4%	3.4%	10.2%
Good	51.7%	40.5%	39.2%	33.3%	44.5%	41.3%
Fair	27.8%	36.2%	37.1%	43.0%	41.8%	37.1%
Poor	6.7%	12.3%	11.8%	16.3%	10.3%	11.3%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 8: Distribution of Units within Submarket Areas by Gross Rent

Gross Rent	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Less than \$200	1.2%	1.3%	2.3%	13.0%	14.3%	4.6%
\$200 to \$299	13.0%	22.1%	15.4%	30.6%	21.1%	18.2%
\$300 to \$399	31.5%	28.2%	26.3%	24.1%	27.8%	27.3%
\$400 to \$499	23.5%	24.2%	26.3%	16.7%	16.5%	23.5%
\$500 to \$599	9.9%	11.4%	17.1%	7.4%	12.0%	14.0%
\$600 and higher	21.0%	12.8%	12.6%	8.3%	8.3%	12.5%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean	\$492	\$427	\$458	\$356	\$375	\$436

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

**Table 9: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Respondent's
Length of Residence at Current Address**

Length of Residence	Neighborhood					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
May 1958 and Earlier	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.1%
June 1958 to May 1968	1.8%	1.9%	0.6%	8.3%	2.9%	1.7%
June 1968 to May 1978	13.2%	8.4%	8.3%	14.2%	10.0%	9.4%
June 1978 to May 1983	29.9%	20.6%	14.4%	15.8%	21.4%	18.4%
June 1983 to May 1987	31.7%	44.5%	41.1%	35.8%	38.6%	40.2%
June 1987 to September 1988	23.4%	24.5%	35.6%	25.8%	26.4%	30.2%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of
rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 10: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Respondent Method of Finding Present Unit

Method	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Former Tenant	27.4%	29.6%	36.4%	22.4%	25.7%	31.7%
Knowing the Landlord	16.2%	12.3%	16.0%	12.7%	16.9%	15.3%
Word of Mouth	16.2%	13.0%	13.4%	27.6%	16.2%	14.7%
Newspaper Ad	9.5%	6.8%	4.3%	6.0%	8.8%	6.1%
Rental Agency	14.5%	18.5%	10.7%	17.2%	15.5%	13.7%
Through University	5.6%	7.4%	7.5%	3.0%	4.1%	6.5%
Other	10.6%	12.3%	11.8%	11.2%	12.8%	11.9%
% Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

**Table 11: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Respondent's
Prior Place of Residence**

Prior Residence	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Berkeley	51.1%	43.6%	53.2%	50.4%	42.3%	49.1%
Other East Bay	23.9%	33.1%	16.5%	26.3%	31.5%	23.5%
Other Bay Area	9.4%	12.3%	10.1%	13.5%	12.8%	11.1%
Outside Bay Area	15.6%	11.0%	20.2%	9.8%	13.4%	16.3%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of
rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 12: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Household Types

Household Type	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Person Living Alone	55.9%	44.9%	50.0%	42.2%	59.5%	50.9%
Married Couple Without Children	12.3%	14.1%	10.3%	9.6%	6.3%	10.5%
Married Couple with Children	7.8%	10.9%	7.1%	10.4%	2.4%	7.2%
Unmarried Couple without Children	5.6%	8.3%	4.9%	5.2%	4.0%	5.5%
Unmarried Couple with Children	1.1%	1.9%	1.6%	2.2%	0.8%	1.5%
Single Mother with Children	2.8%	5.1%	2.2%	20.7%	11.9%	5.3%
Single Father with Children	0.0%	2.6%	0.5%	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%
Related Adults Other Than Parents and Children	1.7%	1.9%	1.1%	3.0%	0.8%	1.3%
Unrelated Adults Other Than Couples	11.7%	9.6%	21.7%	5.9%	11.1%	15.8%
Other	1.1%	0.6%	0.5%	0.0%	2.4%	0.9%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 13: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Total Household Income

Income	Submarket Area					Citywide Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
Less Than \$5,000	3.4%	8.3%	12.5%	14.0%	14.3%	11.2%
\$5,000 to \$9,999	9.1%	14.1%	17.0%	23.3%	22.1%	16.9%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	13.6%	24.4%	15.9%	20.9%	15.0%	17.4%
\$15,000 to \$19,999	10.8%	7.7%	9.1%	16.3%	12.1%	9.8%
\$20,000 to \$24,999	13.6%	11.5%	14.8%	11.6%	10.7%	13.2%
\$25,000 to \$29,999	13.6%	12.2%	6.8%	6.2%	7.9%	8.7%
\$30,000 to \$39,999	17.0%	12.2%	13.6%	3.9%	11.4%	12.9%
\$40,000 to \$49,999	8.5%	4.5%	6.8%	1.6%	4.3%	5.9%
\$50,000 to \$59,999	5.1%	2.6%	1.1%	0.8%	2.1%	2.0%
\$60,000 to \$74,999	2.3%	2.6%	2.3%	0.8%	0.0%	1.9%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
\$100,000 or more	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
% Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean **	\$28,026	\$21,025	\$20,369	\$15,562	\$17,696	\$20,545

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

** Means are derived assuming each response is at the midpoint of its income category.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 14: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Respondent's Ethnicity **

Ethnicity	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
White	83.4%	63.5%	68.9%	45.4%	57.4%	66.2%
Black	0.0%	13.8%	2.2%	33.8%	33.8%	11.2%
Hispanic	3.4%	4.4%	3.3%	9.2%	1.4%	3.4%
Asian	13.1%	16.4%	25.1%	8.5%	6.8%	18.3%
Native American	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.4%
Other	0.0%	0.6%	0.5%	2.3%	0.0%	0.5%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

** This table is based on only rent-controlled housing, and not the entire rental housing stock of Berkeley. In order to estimate accurately the percentages for all rental housing in Berkeley (for comparison with 1980 Census data), other rental units, especially public and assisted housing, must be included.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

**Table 15: Distribution within Submarket Areas of
Percent of Income Paid to Rent**

Percent of Income	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Less than 20%	44.7%	38.5%	38.8%	32.6%	36.3%	38.6%
20 to 24 percent	13.2%	8.5%	14.4%	12.0%	20.4%	14.1%
25 to 30 percent	12.5%	15.4%	11.5%	18.5%	8.0%	12.0%
30.1 to 34.9 percent	11.8%	7.7%	9.4%	6.5%	6.2%	8.6%
35 to 49 percent	9.2%	18.5%	10.8%	18.5%	10.6%	12.4%
50 percent or more	8.6%	11.5%	15.1%	12.0%	18.6%	14.3%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Median						
Mean						0.0%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 16: Distribution of Rent to Income Ratio by Total Household Income

Rent to Income Ratio	Income						Percent in Rent Ratio Category
	Less than \$10,000	\$10,000 to \$19,999	\$20,000 to \$29,999	\$30,000 to \$39,999	\$40,000 to \$49,999	\$50,000 and higher	
Less than 20%	0.3%	3.3%	13.0%	12.3%	5.2%	4.5%	38.6%
20 to 24 percent	0.5%	4.9%	6.2%	1.5%	0.9%	0.1%	14.1%
25 to 30 percent	0.7%	6.4%	3.9%	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	12.0%
30.1 to 34.9 percent	0.4%	5.9%	2.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	8.6%
35 to 49 percent	5.0%	6.8%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	12.4%
50 percent or more	12.1%	2.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Percent in Income Category	19.0%	29.4%	25.5%	14.7%	6.6%	4.8%	100.0%

Note: Citywide percentages are weighted based on the total number of rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

**Table 17: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Responses to Survey Question 1:
How successful do you think the rent and eviction control law has been in
preventing unfair rent increases?**

Response	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Very successful	52.8%	54.1%	50.8%	47.8%	46.2%	50.7%
Somewhat successful	34.1%	32.7%	34.1%	31.3%	40.0%	34.7%
Not very successful	3.4%	4.4%	7.0%	8.2%	2.8%	5.5%
Completely unsuccessful	1.7%	0.6%	1.1%	0.7%	0.7%	1.0%
No opinion	8.0%	8.2%	7.0%	11.9%	10.3%	8.1%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of
rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

**Table 18: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Responses to Survey Question 2:
How successful do you think the rent and eviction control law has been in
preventing unfair evictions?**

Response	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Very successful	36.7%	44.3%	38.6%	40.3%	41.0%	40.0%
Somewhat successful	31.1%	20.9%	28.8%	30.6%	31.3%	28.0%
Not very successful	2.3%	3.8%	5.4%	4.5%	3.5%	4.4%
Completely unsuccessful	1.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.4%
No opinion	28.8%	31.0%	26.6%	23.9%	24.3%	27.2%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of
rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

**Table 19: Distribution within Submarket Areas of Responses to Survey Question 3:
How successful do you think the law has been in maintaining affordable housing
fo low & fixed income people, minorities, students, the disabled and the elderly?**

Response	Submarket Area					Citywide *
	1	2	3	4	5	
Very successful	23.2%	32.1%	28.8%	30.1%	28.0%	28.8%
Somewhat successful	37.3%	31.4%	33.2%	40.6%	37.1%	34.2%
Not very successful	26.0%	21.8%	21.7%	12.8%	18.2%	21.1%
Completely unsuccessful	6.2%	1.3%	7.6%	3.8%	2.8%	5.2%
No opinion	7.3%	13.5%	8.7%	12.8%	14.0%	10.6%
% of Total by Area	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Citywide average is a weighted mean based on the total number of
rent-controlled units per submarket area.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988



No. 52502

Ausberg

A Bucrum & Pedra Co.